

Meeting Objectives

1. Revisit working group charge and guiding principles
2. Update and discussion on ACEES feedback
3. Review performance descriptors (primarily at the 3 and 4 level) using a checklist and determine whether each one:
 - Accurately reflect performance at the 4 and 3 level
 - Contains concrete and specific language
 - Is observable and low-inference
 - Is student-centered where possible
4. Identify performance descriptors that need to be revised based on the criteria above and revise wording where necessary

Working Group Charge

The Teacher Professional Practice working group will define the elements of teacher professional practice (including content knowledge) to be assessed as part of a teacher's evaluation, as well as the indicators used to measure each element, and establish a rubric that delineates performance standards at each level. In addition, the group will gather feedback on the way information about teachers' professional practices should be included in the Rhode Island Model (RI Model).

Note: This working group will focus on the professional practice of classroom teachers. While the RI Model will eventually cover support staff (counselors, library media specialists, social workers, etc) as well, RIDE will focus first on classroom teacher and building administrator evaluations for roll out in the 2011-12 school year, with a staggered timeline for development and implementation of the evaluation systems for school support staff and district administration.

Guiding Principles

All professional practices included in the RI Model should be:

- Grounded in real-world practice (i.e., address practical tasks);
- Crafted in such a way that maximally benefits the students of Rhode Island;
- Articulated as concretely and specifically as possible in order to ensure fairness and consistency;
- Observable over the course of reasonable and normal professional interactions with the educator or assessable based on transparent and professionally gathered data; and
- Fair, accurate, and consistent.

In addition, the Teacher Professional Practices included in the RI Model should:

- Be aligned with the state's school accountability system and with the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS);
- Establish a common understanding of the skill- and knowledge-based expectations for all Rhode Island teachers, other than teacher impact on student learning outcomes;
- Be student-centered whenever possible (i.e., be described in terms that focuses on what the students are doing, not what the teacher is doing); and
- Apply to all teachers regardless of experience level or grade level and subject area taught.

Resources for Discussion:

Example of concrete/specific language versus

General/Vague	Concrete/Specific
Teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are <u>honored</u> in the school.	Teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, report that their ideals are valued and positively represented in discussion and curriculum.
<i>The word honored is not defined, leaving its definition up for interpretation.</i>	<i>Specific language eliminates some of the subjectivity and provides a more concrete example as to how students might be honored.</i>

Example of high and low inference criteria (as well as student-centered language):

High Inference and Teacher-Centered	Low Inference and Student-Centered
EX: Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of the level of student engagement which is supported with details and addresses specific examples of positive and/or negative student actions.	EX: Teacher has developed a classroom culture where 95-100% of the students are engaged in the learning activity, as demonstrated by their attentiveness and participation. EX: 85%-90% of hands are raised when reviewing taught material. More than 50% of hands are up on new material EX: Students take notes on new material without being prompted and ask questions of the teacher and partners when unclear on a topic.
<i>Has evaluator look at teacher effort, but does not require evaluator assess whether the teacher's effort was ultimately successful in engaging students. (i.e., focuses on inputs and less on outputs)</i>	<i>Evaluates a teacher's ability to actually engage students by directly assessing the level of student engagement</i> <i>The third example still relies on observable, student-centered behavior without assigning a numeric benchmark.</i>

Agenda/Key Questions

- Beginning with domain 2 (Classroom Instruction), review the level 3 and 4 performance descriptors and check the appropriate box if it meets the necessary criteria. After you have checked (or not checked) any boxes, use the notes space to provide written comments to justify your scoring. If particular words or phrases are striking, be sure to note them.
 - ☐ Adequately reflects level 4 performance - *Does this sound like something a top-notch, level 4 teacher would do? Is the level of rigor appropriate?*
 - ☐ Adequately reflects level 3 performance - *Does this sound like something an effective, level 3 teacher would do? Is the level of rigor appropriate?*
 - ☐ Specific/concrete – *Is the language in the performance descriptor concrete and specific such that several evaluators would likely interpret it similarly?*
 - ☐ Observable/low-inference – *Can this be observed in a classroom? Is it low-inference, giving the evaluator a clear picture of what he or she would look to observe?*
 - ☐ Student-centered – *Is the language focused on outcomes and what students are doing rather than what the teacher is doing?*
- Share out any competencies and descriptors that meet all criteria for being specific and concrete, low-inference and student-centered.
- For the remaining that need adjusting, what language needs to be changed at the 4 and 3 level in order to make sure the tool can be used consistently?